



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,943	02/22/2002	Loren J. Field	7037-458	6536

7590 08/25/2004

Kenneth A. Gandy
Woodard, Emhardt, Naughton, Moriarty & McNett
Bank One Center/Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137

EXAMINER

WOITACH, JOSEPH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1632

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/080,943

Applicant(s)

FIELD ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph T. Weitach

Art Unit

1632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10, 18-22 and 28-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 11-17 and 23-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This application filed February 22, 2002, is a continuation of PCT/US00/23161 with the international filing date of August 23, 2000, which claims benefit to US provisional application 60/150,266 filed August 23, 1999.

Claims 1-40 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group VII, claims 15-17, in the reply filed on June 4, 2004 is acknowledged. Upon review of the claims, Examiner has determined it would not be an undue burden to examine both groups VI and V in the instant action. Therefore, the restriction requirement between groups V and VI is withdrawn. Applicants state the right to reserve the right for rejoinder of method claims, however because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement of each of the different inventions, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or

Art Unit: 1632

allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP 804.01.

Claims 1-40 are pending. Claims 1-10, 18-22 and 28-40 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Claims 11-17, 23-27 are currently under examination as they are drawn to a vector encoding p193 and a host cell comprising a vector.

Art Unit: 1632

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Specification

The nucleotide sequence disclosure contained in this application does not comply with the requirements for such a disclosure as set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.821 - 1.825. Applicant's attention is directed to the final rulemaking notice published at 63 FR 29620 (June 1, 1998) and 1211 OG 82 (June 23, 1998). Specifically, the drawing contain sequences that have not been identified by SEQ ID NOs. It is noted that a sequencing listing has been submitted, however it does not appear to contain all the sequences disclosed in the instant specification. For example figure 2b has several amino acid sequences that require specific sequence identifiers, and on page 12, line 28.

Appropriate correction is required.

The absence of proper sequence listing did not preclude the examination on the merits however, **for a complete response to this office action, applicant must submit the required material for sequence compliance.**

Art Unit: 1632

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." It is noted that the specification cites multiple references throughout the specification, however none of have been provided in the form of an IDS. Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered. Moreover, it may be that these documents may have been improperly incorporated by reference (see page 48, final lines). As set forth in *Advanced Display Systems Inc. v. Kent State University* (Fed. Cir. 2000) 54 USPQ2d at 1679:

Incorporation by reference provides a method for integrating material from various documents into a host document--a patent or printed publication in an anticipation determination--by citing such material in a manner that makes it clear that the material is effectively part of the host document as if it were explicitly contained therein. *See General Elec. Co. v. Brenner*, 407 F.2d 1258, 1261-62, 159 USPQ 335, 337 (D.C. Cir. 1968); *In re Lund*, 376 F.2d 982, 989, 153 USPQ 625, 631 (CCPA 1967). **To incorporate material by reference, the host document must identify with detailed particularity what specific material it incorporates and clearly indicate where that material is found in the various documents.** *See In re Seversky*, 474 F.2d 671, 674, 177 USPQ 144, 146 (CCPA 1973) (providing that incorporation by reference requires a statement "clearly identifying the subject matter which is incorporated and where it is to be found"); *In re Saunders*, 444 F.2d 599, 602-02, 170 USPQ 213, 216-17 (CPA 1971) (reasoning that a rejection or anticipation is appropriate only if one reference "expressly incorporates a particular part" of another reference); *National Latex Prods. Co. v. Sun Rubber Co.*, 274 F.2d 224, 230, 123 USPQ 279, 283 (6th Cir. 1959) (requiring a specific reference to material in an earlier application in order to have that material considered a part of a later application); *cf. Lund*, 376 F.2d at 989, 13 USPQ at 631 (holding that **a one sentence reference to an abandoned application is not sufficient to incorporate from the abandoned application into a new application**). (Emphasis added.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 11-17, 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The final Written Description Examination guidelines that were published on January 5, 2001 (66 FR 1099; available at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/menu/current.html>).

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 1991), clearly states that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19USPQ2d at 1117. The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19USPQ2d at 1116. In the instant case, the basis of the instant rejection focuses on the nucleic acid sequence encompassed by the claims present in the vector and host cell. Specifically, the teaching and written description provided in the instant specification for any “p193 protein” lacks adequate written description. For the sake of this rejection, p193 is being interpreted in part for describing a protein with a molecular weight of 193 kDa. It is noted that the specification teaches the isolation and characterization of a specific sequence that encodes a protein that has a molecular

Art Unit: 1632

weight of 193 kDa, however the specification fails to provide any clear guidance to any other sequences, in particular to any sequence encoding any unrelated protein with a molecular weight of 193 kDa to that specifically set forth in the specification. The specification fails to adequately define what is encompassed by the term “p193” and fails to describe all the possible sequences capable of encoding any 193 kDa protein including all the possible functional properties of these encoded proteins. Moreover, it is noted that the claims 23-27 specifically set forth specific identity to a SEQ ID NO, however there is no specific basis for determining the identity, nor any functional limitation that the sequences must comprise. The claimed invention as a whole is not adequately described if the claims require essential or critical elements which are not adequately described in the specification and which are not conventional in the art as of Applicants effective filing date. Possession may be shown by actual reduction to practice, clear depiction of the invention in a detailed drawing, or by describing the invention with sufficient relevant identifying characteristics (as it relates to the claimed invention as a whole) such that a person skilled in the art would recognize that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. *Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, Inc.*, 48 USPQ2d 1641, 1646 (1998). In the instant case, Applicants have claimed a nucleic acid sequence encoding a p193 protein, however the specification fails to describe the relevant identifying characteristics of any of the nucleic acid sequences of a sufficient number of sequences which can be used in the instantly claimed method. The skilled artisan cannot envision all the possible variant nucleic acid sequences encompassed by the claims, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method used. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential

Art Unit: 1632

method of identifying it. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants attention is drawn to the decision of *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company* (CAFC, July 1997) wherein it was stated:

In claims involving chemical materials, generic formulas usually indicate with specificity what the generic claims encompass. One skilled in the art can distinguish such a formula from others and can identify many of the species that the claims encompass. Accordingly, such a formula is normally an adequate written description of the claimed genus. In claims to genetic material, however, a generic statement such as “vertebrate insulin cDNA” or “mammalian cDNA,” without more, is not an adequate written description of the genus because it does not distinguish the claimed genus from others, except by function. It does not specifically define any of the genes that fall within its definition. It does not define any structural features commonly possessed by members of the genus that distinguish them from others. One skilled in the art therefore cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of the members of the genus. A definition by function, as we have previously indicated, does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what the gene does, rather than what it is. See *Fiers*, 984 F.2d at 1169-71, 25 USPQ2d at 1605-06 (discussing *Amgen*). It is only a definition of a useful result rather than a definition of what it achieves as a result. Many such genes may achieve that result. The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 222 USPQ 369, 372-373 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does “little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate.”). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF’s were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence. In the instant case, the simple recitation of the name of an encoded protein size fails to clearly describe all the possible sequences encompassed by such a name, thus the rejected claim fails to meet the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Art Unit: 1632

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11-17 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically:

Claim 11 is unclear in the recitation of “including nucleic acid encoding a p193 protein” because it is unclear what the limitation “including” defines. It is unclear if an entire coding sequence is required or if it encompasses any short nucleic acid sequence that shares homology with p193, such as that provided by a common restriction site. In particular, it appears that the expression vector is not required even to produce a protein since it can be inserted in an antisense orientation, though antisense relative to what is not set forth in claim 12 since claim 11 does not set forth any other vector requirements. Further, it is unclear what is encompassed by “a p193 protein” recited in claims 11 and 15, since this name is not specifically defined in the specification in such a way to provide any structural or functional limitation to the name.

Claims 13 and 16 are unclear in the recitation of “pro-apoptotic” since this is a characteristic of p193 described in the specification. It is unclear how setting forth a characteristic of the protein further limits claims 11 or 15.

Claims 14 and 17 are unclear in the recitation of “a dominant negative mutation” because this is relative to the starting sequence and any particular function it may have. As discussed above, it is unclear what a p193 sequence encompasses, and so what would be considered a mutation of p193 can only be determined relative to a given starting material.

Art Unit: 1632

Claims 23-27 are vague and unclear in the recitation of "identity" because the metes and bounds are relative to how identity is calculated. A percent identity can be calculated in a variety of ways known in the art, with variation on what is considered identical and how to calculate the percent identity dependent on potential GAP values and total length being compared.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Pasumarthi KB, Tsai SC, Field LJ. Circ Res. 2001 May 25;88(10):1004-11. Coexpression of mutant p53 and p193 renders embryonic stem cell-derived cardiomyocytes responsive to the growth-promoting activities of adenoviral E1A.

Tsai SC, Pasumarthi KB, Pajak L, Franklin M, Patton B, Wang H, Henzel WJ, Stults JT, Field LJ. J Biol Chem. 2000 Feb 4;275(5):3239-46. Simian virus 40 large T antigen binds a novel Bcl-2 homology domain 3-containing proapoptosis protein in the cytoplasm.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed. The claims are free of the art of record because the art fails to teach an isolated nucleic acid sequence encoding a p193 protein, and more specifically that set forth in SEQ ID NOs: 2-4. However, the claims are subject to other rejections.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Woitach whose telephone number is (571) 272-0739.

Art Unit: 1632

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Reynolds, can be reached at (571) 272-0734.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group analyst Dianiece Jacobs whose telephone number is (571) 272-0532.

Joseph T. Voitach

Joe Voitach
Art 1632